

# VIRGINIA ARGUS.

[XIVth YEAR.]

A FREE PRESS MAINTAINS THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE

[No. 1282]

RICHMOND:—PRINTED (ON WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS) BY SAMUEL PLEASANTS, JUNIOR, PRINTER TO THE COMMONWEALTH.

[Four Dollars Per Annum....paid in advance.]

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1866.

[12 1-2 Cents Single.]

Buckingham County, May term, 1866.

William Brown and Company, Complainants.

Against Elisha Hakes and Jacob L. Abrahams, Defendants.

ON the motion of the complainants by their counsel, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that the defendant Elisha Hakes hath removed himself without the jurisdiction of this court, to parts unknown, *It is ordered and decreed*, that unless the said defendant Hakes, shall appear here on or before August term next and answer the bill of the complainants, that the court will then proceed to decree the matter according to the prayer of the said bill; and that a copy of this order be forthwith published in some public newspaper of the city of Richmond for two months successively, and another copy be posted up at the front door of the courthouse of this county.

A Copy—Teste, Rolfe Eldridge, Jr. D. C.

VIRGINIA:

At a Quarterly Court continued and held for Pittsylvania County, the 21st day of May, 1866.

Anthony Holloway and Anne his wife, John Yeaman and Mary his wife, & Henry Pell and Sarah his wife, Plaintiffs.

Against Elisha L. Williams and Presley Williams, Defendants.

THE defendants not having entered their appearance and given security according to the act of assembly and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that they are not inhabitants of this county; on the motion of the plaintiffs by their counsel, *It is ordered*, that the said defendants do appear here on the third Monday in August next and answer the plaintiff's bill, and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some newspaper published in this county for eight weeks successively, and posted up at the front door of the courthouse on some court day.

A Copy—Teste, Will Tunstall, C. P. C.

VIRGINIA:

In the Superior Court of Chancery, holden at the Capitol, in Richmond, the 25th March, 1866.

John Price, surviving trustee of Samuel Beall, deceased, Plaintiff.

Against William Moseley, Defendant.

THE defendant not having entered his appearance and given security according to the act of assembly and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that he is not an inhabitant of this county; on the motion of the plaintiff by counsel, *It is ordered*, that the said defendant do appear here on the first day of the next September term and answer the bill of the plaintiff, and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some newspaper published in the city of Richmond for two months successively, and posted at the front door of the capitol in the said city.

A Copy—Teste, Peter Tinsley, C. C.

At a court continued and held for Albemarle county, the 3d June, 1866.

Samuel Shelton & Company, Plaintiffs.

Against John Martin and Walter Leake, Defendants.

THIS day came the plaintiffs aforesaid by their counsel, and the defendant John Martin, not having entered his appearance and given security according to the act of assembly and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that he is not an inhabitant of this county; on the motion of the plaintiffs by their counsel, *It is ordered and decreed*, by the court, that the defendant John Martin do appear here on the first day of the next term, and answer the bill of the plaintiff, and that a copy of this order be forthwith published in some public newspaper published in the city of Richmond for two months successively, and that another copy be posted at the front door of the courthouse of this county.

A Copy—Teste, Alex. Garrett, D. C. A. C.

Buckingham March Term 1866.

Thomas Walke, Complainant.

Against John Heath, Elizabeth Heath and Edward Heath, Defendants.

ON the motion of the complainant by his counsel, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that the defendant John Heath is not an inhabitant of this county; *It is ordered and decreed*, that unless the said defendant John, shall appear here on or before August term next, and answer the complainant's bill, that the same will then be taken for confessed, and the matter thereof decreed accordingly; and that a copy of this order be published for two months successively in some one of the public newspapers printed in the city of Richmond, and another copy of the said order be posted up at the front door of the courthouse of this county.

A Copy—Teste, Rolfe Eldridge, Jr. D. C.

At a court held for Prince Edward county, June the 16th, 1866.

Hart and Nimmo, Complainants.

Against Champion Arnold and Christopher H. Holland, Defendants.

THE defendant Arnold, not having entered his appearance and given security according to an act of the General Assembly and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that he is not an inhabitant of this county; on the motion of the complainants by their counsel, *It is ordered*, That the said defendant Arnold, do appear here on the first day of September next, and answer the complainants' bill, and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some one of the public newspapers printed in the city of Richmond for two months successively, and also posted at the front door of the courthouse of this county.

A Copy—Teste, BENJAMIN WATKINS, D. C.

In Henrico County Court.

Elisha Liggan, Complainant.

Against Robert Robinson and Polly his wife, who was Polly Liggan, widow of Samuel Liggan, dec. Henry Liggan, an infant child of the said decedent, and Robert Franklin and Mary Franklin, Willis Liggan, and Sherwood Liggan, Defts.

THE defendants Willis and Sherwood Liggan not having entered their appearance and given security according to the act of assembly in such case made and provided, and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that they are not inhabitants of this county; on the motion of the complainant by his counsel, *It is ordered*, that the said defendants do appear here on the first Monday in September next and answer the bill of the complainant, and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some one of the newspapers published in the city of Richmond for two months successively, and posted at the courthouse door on two successive court days.

Teste, Geo. Chisman, D. C.

Buckingham county, July Court, 1866.

Joseph Clarke and John Harris, Complainants.

Against Zacharias Talliaferro, Charles Patterson and John Haskerville, Defendants.

ON the motion of the complainants by their counsel, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court, that the defendant Talliaferro and Patterson are not inhabitants of this county, *It is ordered*, and decreed that unless they shall appear here on or before November term next, and answer the bill of the complainants, the same will then be taken for confessed, and the matter thereof decreed accordingly; and that a copy of this order be forthwith published for two months successively in some public newspaper of the city of Richmond, and another copy be posted up at the front door of the courthouse of the said county.

A Copy—Teste, ROLFE ELDRIDGE, Jr. D. C.

St. PAUL,

A beautiful sorrel horse, 15 hands 3 inches high, remarkable for his elegance, beauty, strength and fine bone; will stand the ensuing season, at my plantation on James river, generally known by the name of Maiden's Adventure, about 3 miles above Fines Creek mill, and 4 miles below Michael's ferry, in Powhatan county, to cover mares at twenty-five dollars the season, which will commence the first of March, and expire the first of August—Extraordinary good and extensive pasturage gratis, but no liability for accidents or escapes. Gentlemen wishing their mares fed, may be furnished with corn at the market price, for which cash must be sent with the mares—as also, notes of hand for the due payment of the money for the season.

N. B. Twenty dollars, paid on or before the third Wednesday in November (being Powhatan court day) will be received as full compensation of the above, with half a dol. to the groom.

This beautiful horse, St. Paul, was raised by the Prince of Wales, and got by his horse Saltram, who was got by Eclipse that covered at 200 guineas the season—his dam Virago by Snap—his grandam by Regulus, out of a sister to Black and all-black, and was thought to be the best runner of his time—he won several large stakes, among which was the Derby, 1783, beating Dungannon, Volunteer, Phenomenon, Gonzales, and several others—he was the sire of Whiskey, who at 3 years old won 4550 guineas, also of Whip, Royalist, Peeping Tom, General, Colner, Sylph, Septim, Caroline, Tiffany, Lauretta, St. David, Sprightly, Queen of Sheba, Spankaway, Rose, Sweeper, Olyus, Coal Merchant, Pickpocket, Oscar, Ambrosio, Pretty Patty, and several others of the first rate runners. St. Paul's dam Purity was got by Marchion, who covered for several of the last years of his life at 50 guineas a mare—her dam the Old Squire mare, of as great fame perhaps, as a good breeder, as any mare in the kingdom—she was the dam of Virgo, Dido, Conundrum, Ranthos, Enigma, Miss Timms, Pumpkin, Maiden (who was dam of Walnut) Le Sang, Rascals, Parity, and several others. Purity was the dam of Rockingham, Archibald, Firzwilliam, St. Paul and several others—Several certificates of St. Paul as a good and sure foot getter may be seen at his stand.

THOMAS HARRIS, Jr. Powhatan city, March 1st, 1866.

Richmond James River Company.

AT an adjourned meeting of the Richmond James River Company on 24th July, 1866. Whereas the Legislature of Virginia has, without the consent of this company, proceeded to alter the act incorporating the same in many essential parts; by which it is deemed unsafe to proceed further in the improvement contemplated at the original formation of the company, and that it is also improper to incur any additional expense under an order of the company dated 15 February last;

Resolved therefore, That the President and Directors be requested to cause the machine to be put in a state of repair and sold, together with the negroes and other property belonging to the company, and that a final adjustment of the affairs of the same be brought to an immediate close, and that the Treasurer be requested to call upon those members of the company who have not paid their respective requirements, to make immediate payment thereof—Extract from the minutes.

ROBERT POLLARD, CPE.

A FRESH SUPPLY OF

Church's Cough Drops

Is just received from the Proprietor's Dispensary, New York, and for sale at this office

THE SECOND VOLUME OF

CHASE'S TRIAL,

BY SAM'L R. SMITH, Is just received, and ready for delivery to subscribers at this office. A few copies of the work complete, for sale as above.

Observations on the speech of the hon. John Randolph, Representative for the state of Virginia, in the general Congress of America, on a motion for the non importation of British merchandise pending the present dispute between Great Britain and America. By the author of War in disguise.

(Continued.)

Yet this is, in truth, but a part of the enormous case. By what means has France acquired the power of enforcing her prohibition? By the same foul means which have enabled her to overthrow Austria, to break up the foundation of the Germanic empire, and add all Italy to her usurpations; by the most audacious violations of neutral rights, that ever disgraced the page of history, or subverted the security of nations.

Here, we have no controverted principles to assume, in maintaining the oppressive charge. It is not, that on the ocean, and in the interruption of a commercial intercourse with a belligerent, neutral pretensions are opposed; but it is that into the heart of peaceful cities, and among the villages of a harmless peasantry, armies are sent to levy contributions, or pursue their desolating march by a power which does not allege against the hapless sufferers either the rights of war, or the provocation of a wrong. Ansbach, Hanover, Switzerland, Hamburg, Frankfurt, even Rome itself, where a reconciled apostate might have been restrained by decent respect to the superstition he has professed to resume, these, and many other places, need but be named, to call up abhorrence of the usurpers maxims, and to show his utter contempt for the most acknowledged and sacred of neutral rights, whenever he has power to invade them. Even bed chambers are unsafe for princes in the bosom of a neutral court.

But are other nations responsible for these outrages? not directly so, I admit. Whether it be not a duty of neutral powers to unite in controlling them, and protecting those sacred principles by which the community of nations is bound together from further violation, is a question not hard to decide. But all I contend for here, is the very moderate position, that neutral nations ought not actively to assist in giving effect to a system, which is planted, sustained and expanded by these invasions of neutral rights.

If they will tamely permit Bonaparte to exclude ships when laden with our merchandise from Hamburg, and such other maritime places, yet permitted to be called neutral, as the terror of his arms has already shut against us; and to extend as he now threatens, the same system to Portugal and Denmark; it is not neutral, it is not equal, to deny a like latitude to us; and they would have no right to complain, if we should apply the same interdiction as generally to the merchandise of our enemies, wherever our power extends; that is, to every maritime part of the globe.

Colonial produce and supplies alone, are the subject now in dispute with America; but here is a principle, on which we might fairly interdict the carriage of French, Spanish, and Dutch goods in general, whether colonial or European; and not in particular voyages alone, but in any part of the ocean. If not, then the rights and duties of neutrality are all on one side, and Bonaparte has already obtained some of the legal effects of that sovereignty, to which he now openly aspires over the kings and kingdoms of the earth. He has imperial prerogatives in the courts of nations, in which a British monarch has no right to participate.

Hitherto it is a principle of neutral reason, to which no writer on the law of nations has objected, and which most of them have expressly affirmed, that impartiality is one of the duties of neutral states; and a breach of this duty is, that what they permit to one belligerent, they must be ready to permit to the other. Even the king of Prussia, acknowledged this obligation, when he gave passage to the Russian army, on hearing the violation of Ansbach; nor has the French despot himself, had the assurance openly to find fault with the act.

But America, it may be said perhaps, has not yet been prevented by France, from carrying any goods whatever to the ports of this country, or our colonies. France, I admit, has not extended her commercial interdiction, where she had not power to extend it. She has no naval arms, and therefore can bolt the door against commerce on the inside only, not lock it from without; nor can she prevent importations into countries, into which her battalions cannot advance.

But if she has not prevented importation by neutral vessels, into England, she has done more, much more for the purpose of my argument, by excluding them from neutral ports.

America is prevented from importing British goods into Hamburg for instance, not because it is the will of the senate of Hamburg, but because it is the mandate of France; and America will submit to this prohibition, as she has done to other injuries of the same species, from the same unprincipled power. On what consistent pretence then could she complain, if we should forbid her carrying French goods, whether colonial or European, to Copenhagen or Lisbon? How otherwise are we to obtain equality, in respect of neutral commerce.

We may blockade, it is true, the ports from which our goods are excluded; but this is often an ineffectual resort, as well as always an expensive one, and a diversion of our naval force from more active service. Neither can it be expected, that we can spread our blockades over every harbour or accessible coast, to which Bonaparte can extend his exclusive system by land.

Besides it would be absurd to maintain that we may lawfully blockade neutral ports as a rightful defence against this unprecedented system of war and yet have no right to retaliate on the trade of the enemy's ports, lest neutral interests should suffer.

The blockade too, however completely enforced would be obviously ineffectual, to prevent the meditated injury to our colonies and our commerce. Our sugars are shut out from Hamburg, and we exclude French & Spanish sugars in return by our blockade. What then? If we allow the latter to be carried to Embden, to Antwerp, or any other blockaded port, the same continental markets are effectually supplied by means of interior navigation, with the French or Spanish article, which Hamburg before supplied with the British.

If, by a just and necessary retaliation, we should prevent the supply generally in neutral bottoms, the growing dearth of the article would soon frustrate the hostile prohibition, or oblige the enemy to recall it; but while French and Spanish produce, can be plentifully obtained from neighboring ports, this natural remedy cannot operate; and our blockade rather tends in a commercial view to increase, than diminish the evil.

The partiality therefore in the acquiescence and the resistance of neutral states, amounts not merely to passive justice, but to an active and pernicious co-operation with the enemy in his efforts to destroy our commerce; yet though he tramples for that end of the most indisputable rights of neutrals, their extreme, abstract, and most doubtful rights, are strangely set up against us, to effluinate his injurious purpose.

The main though preposterous defence of the frustration of our hostilities against the enemy's colonial trade, is his right to open his own ports; but has he a right to shut all neutral ports, as well as to open his own? Here at least the land right, will not bear out the sea wrong. Besides, America has now shrunk from this favorite principle of hers, when she had to deal with a power that would not be quelled. She has not suffered France to take her ships when trading to St. Domingo, but at the imperious mandate of that power has passed a law to forbid the trade to her subjects. Is it because Dessalines has not as good a title to Hayti, as Bonaparte to Naples? I should deny the proposition—even as to Paris; but at least Dessalines has as good a right to make laws in Hayti, as Bonaparte at Hamburg.

If the nation which is called on to submit to such injurious inequality of treatment, were feeble or inferior at sea, the too common disposition in the strong to oppress the weak, might account for the unjust demand. But what in the present case may well excite astonishment, as well as indignation, is, that this injustice is offered to a nation, whose power to resist it, is as indisputable, as her right to do so—whose invincible and magnificent navy rides triumphant on every sea; who, to use the words of Mr. Randolph, "has annihilated the marine of her enemies" and might boldly defy the combined hostility of all the maritime nations on the globe, to snatch the trident from her hand.

That France, an exile from the ocean, should under such circumstances, have the assurance to wage with us a war of commercial exclusions, is singular enough. But if neutrals will persevere in their present conduct, & if England timidly submit to the plan, is perfectly rational & cannot fail of final success.

Behold then a new prodigy of this extraordinary age, the utmost maritime strength is impotent to protect commercial navigation; and a power that is driven from the ocean can destroy the trade of the enemy!

But the paradox is of easy solution.—The plain key to it, is, the new and comprehensive principle that the rights of neutrality, are nothing on shore, but every thing at sea.

If this doctrine is to prevail, let us be seech the people of the United States, to relieve us from the burden of those 800 men of war, which Mr. Randolph, with but a small exaggeration, supposes us at present to possess—to take also off our hands this island, which we cannot long hope to defend, and give us a district beyond the blue mountains, in exchange.

At present we have no such distant retreat, as Mr. R. speaks of, from the arms of an invader; no alternative to that naval war, which he wisely declines.

Surely such new and forcible considerations as the present conjuncture affords, cannot fail to have an influence on the minds of the American people. It is true, they might have been suggested in some degree, by the conduct of France, at an earlier period of the war; but the exclusion of our commerce from the continent, though partially and faintly attempted before, is now the first time distinctly avowed by Bonaparte, as the grand offensive project which is to enforce our submission; and in the execution of which, neutral nations, as he scruples not to threaten, will be constrained to concur. Neither till the defection of Prussia from the standard of neutrality, was the scheme so boldly acted on as at present, or so capable of extensive effect.

Mr. Randolph, in one part of his speech, seems to consider the excuse of necessity, as the chief argument relied upon in the pamphlet, which he does me the honor to quote; but on a reference to the work, it will be found that this was but one, among many foundations of right, on which the rule of the war of 1756 was placed, and to the chief part of which no answer has hitherto been given; and it will further be found, that the author did not profess to argue the question at large, even in respect of the colonial trade, much less to define and defend the whole extent of our maritime rights in the present and unparalleled contest.

There are other views, still more comprehensive and important, upon which it would be much easier to justify the severest war that possibly could be waged against the commerce of our enemy, and the maritime intercourse of his usurped dominions, than to excuse the concessions that have been hitherto made in favor of neutral trade. But neither these, nor the considerations here briefly suggested, have yet been submitted to the candour of the American people.

A magnanimous, but not very prudent contempt of the popular voice in foreign countries, or at least of the means of obtaining its suffrage, has been long displayed by the cabinet of England. We fight, we pay, we negotiate, but except in a formal manifesto, we do not reason to the European and American public. We abandon to our enemies, the influence of every foreign press, even where the fear of French arms does not preclude a competition.

It is perhaps a natural, though accidental consequence, of our peculiar form of government—the rights and the interests of the nation, the grounds of its wars, and its treaties, are copiously discussed in Parliament; and we forget that foreign politicians do not always read our debates.

The grand subject of our maritime rights, at least, has every where, out of England, been left to private and self-interested pens, and these have almost universally been in the service of neutralizing traders. Our enemies therefore have walked over the course in America, as well as in other neutral countries; and the people heaving of nothing but British violence and injustice, have condemned us without trial.

I am led to these remarks by a passage in Mr. Randolph's speech, in which he adopts a notion currently received in America, that "War in Disguise," was written under the eye of Mr. Pitt. The same has also been affirmed confidently in all the newspapers of that country as a known fact, and has been hitherto uncontradicted. Let the author therefore do justice to the independence and freedom of his pen, at the expense of the credit which it might derive from the choice of our late celebrated minister, "War in Disguise," was not written under the eye, nor at the instigation of Mr. Pitt, or any other member of administration; nor was it honored by his perusal till after it was given to the public. Whatever be the weakness or the strength of the arguments it contains, they were spontaneous and sincere; the result of unflinching, and, as their author believes, of impartial opinion.

But to return from this digression.—If new considerations of justice now arise to satisfy the people of the United States, that their demands are groundless in point of right; new and more powerful motives of policy, have also been furnished by the late changes in Europe, to reinforce the arguments of Mr. Randolph.

What hopes, let me ask, can they now retain, of the moderation of France, and how truly alarming to them ought to be the prospect of a maritime peace in Europe,